

Final Scope of the Risk Evaluation for Di-Isodecyl Phthalate (DIDP)

Supplemental File:

Data Extraction and Data Evaluation Tables for Physical and Chemical Property Studies CASRNs 26761-40-0 and 68515-49-1

(Representative structure)

August 2021

Table of Contents

Table 1. Physical State Study Summary for Di-Isodecyl Phthalate (DIDP)	3
Table 2. Physical Properties Study Summary for DIDP	3
Table 3. Melting Point Study Summary for DIDP	3
Table 4. Boiling Point Study Summary for DIDP	4
Table 5. Density Study Summary for DIDP	4
Table 6. Vapor Pressure Study Summary for DIDP	7
Table 7. Vapor Density Study Summary for DIDP	7
Table 8. Water Solubility Study Summary for DIDP	7
Table 9. Octanol Water Coefficient (logKow) Study Summary for DIDP	8
Table 10. Henry's Law Constant Study Summary for DIDP	8
Table 11. Flash Point Study Summary for DIDP	8
Table 12. Auto Flammability Study Summary for DIDP	8
Table 13. Viscosity Study Summary for DIDP	9
Table 14. Refractive Index Study Summary for DIDP	10
Table 15. Dielectric Constant Study Summary for DIDP	10
EPI Suite TM Model Outputs	11
Data Evaluation Tables	15
References	62

Data Extraction Tables

In each table, the value preliminarily selected for use in the risk evaluation is in bold.

Table 1. Physical State Study Summary for Di-Isodecyl Phthalate (DIDP)

Study Type	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Evnovimental	lianid		(NLM 2015)	High
Experimental	liquid		(<u>NLIVI, 2015</u>)	High

Table 2. Physical Properties Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	clear liquid, mild odor		(NLM, 2015)	High
Experimental	colorless oily liquid with mild odor		(<u>RSC, 2019</u>)	High

Table 3. Melting Point Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR	-50°C		(<u>NLM, 2015</u>)	High
Experimental	NR	-50°C		(RSC, 2019)	Medium
Experimental	NR	-50°C		(RSC, 2019)	Medium

Table 4. Boiling Point Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR	250°C	These values are likely at reduced pressure (250-257°C at 4 mm Hg; PhysProp)	(RSC, 2019)	Medium
Experimental	NR	275°C	These values are likely at reduced pressure (250-257°C at 4 mm Hg; PhysProp)	(RSC, 2019)	Medium

Table 5. Density Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Study Details	Reference Substance	Temperature	Dynamic Viscosity	Result Comments		Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental			20°C		$\begin{array}{c} 0.966 \\ \text{g/cm}^3 \end{array}$		(NLM, 2015)	High
Experimental			NR		0.965 g/cm ³		(<u>RSC, 2019</u>)	Medium
Experimental			293.15 K		0.9634 g/cm ³	Value at 298.15 K and 0.10 MPa; vibrating tube densimeter. The temperature was maintained within ±0.05 K, and the pressure had 0.11% uncertainty.	(Brito e Abreu et al., 2010)	High
Experimental			25°C		0.96283 g/cm ³	Determined with an Anton-Paar DMA5000 vibrating-tube densimeter; this source also measured pressure at 0.1 Mpa	(Harris and Bair, 2007)	High

Study Type	Study Details	Reference Substance	Temperature	Dynamic Viscosity	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental			25°C		0.96285 g/cm ³	Value at 25°C and 0.1 MPa; determined with an Anton-Paar DMA5000 vibrating-tube densimeter; this source also measured density at atmospheric pressure	(<u>Harris and</u> Bair, 2007)	High
Experimental			25°C	dongimator:		(Harris and Bair, 2007)	High	
Experimental			25°C		0.96284 g/cm ³	Value at 25°C and 0.1 MPa; determined with an Anton-Paar DMA5000 vibrating-tube densimeter; this source also measured density at atmospheric pressure	(Harris and Bair, 2007)	High
Experimental			NR		0.96284 g/cm ³	Reported as 962.84 kg/m³; this source also measured densities up to 363.188 K	(Assael and Mylona, 2013)	High
Experimental	NR		NR	0.96282 g/cm ³		Reported as 962.82 kg/m³; estimated repeatability of (0.01%); measured using an automatic Anton Paar densimeter (model DMA 5000).	(<u>Caetano et al., 2005</u>)	High
Experimental			298.26 K		962.8 g/L	With 107 ppm water; reported as 962.8 kg/m ³	(<u>Caetano et</u> al., 2006)	High
Experimental			298.16 K		0.96290 g/cm ³	Value reported as 962.90 kg/m³ at 298.16 K. Density measured via the vibrating tube method at atmospheric pressure, between 275.15 and 363.15 K.	(Froeba and Leipertz, 2007)	Medium
Experimental			293.15 K		0.9665 g/cm ³	Reported as 966.5 kg/m ³ at 293.15 K & 0.1 MPa pressure	(<u>Peleties et al., 2010</u>)	High

Study Type	Study Details	Reference Substance	Temperature	Dynamic Viscosity	Result	Result Comments		Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental			298.15 K		0.9632 g/cm ³	298.15 K and 0.1 Mpa	(<u>Paredes et al., 2009</u>)	High
Experimental			298.15 K		0.9628 g/cm ³	298.15 K and 0.1 Mpa	(<u>Paredes et al., 2009</u>)	High
Experimental			298.15 K		0.9630 g/cm ³	298.15 K and 0.1 Mpa	(<u>Paredes et al., 2009</u>)	High
Experimental; Not Reported			298.15 K		0.9601 - 0.96461 g/cm ³	At pressure = 0.1MPa and T = 298.15K, density = 960.1 kg/m³ +/- 2.9, viscosity = 87.5mPaS +/- 1.8 (Sample B). Sample A: density = 963.66 kg/m³ (water mass fraction = 20E-6; viscosity = 87.2 mPa*s) Sample B: density = 960.1 kg/m³ (water mass fraction = 417E-6; viscosity = 87.5 mPa*s) Sample C: density = 964.61 kg/m³ (water mass fraction = 29E-6; viscosity 87.3 mPa*s)	(Al Motari et al., 2007)	High

Table 6. Vapor Pressure Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Temperature	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR		5.28E-7 mm Hg		(<u>NLM, 2015</u>)	High

Table 7. Vapor Density Study Summary for DIDP

No Vapor Density data was identified for this chemical.

Table 8. Water Solubility Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Temperature	pН	Analytical Method	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR	25°C	NR		0.28 mg/L		(<u>NLM, 2015</u>)	High
Experimental	Each sample contained less than 1 % of non-PAE material, as determined by another laboratory.	25°C	NR		1.19 mg/L	Water was ASTM Type 2 water	(<u>Howard et al., 1985</u>)	High

Table 9. Octanol Water Coefficient (logKow) Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Temperature	pН	Other Study Details (Amounts of substance liquid phases)	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR	NR	NR		10.352		(<u>RSC, 2019</u>)	High

Table 10. Henry's Law Constant Study Summary for DIDP

No Henrys Law data was identified for this chemical.

Table 11. Flash Point Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Substance Purity	Temperature	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental	NR		232°C		(<u>RSC, 2019</u>)	Medium
Experimental	NR		122°C		(<u>RSC</u> , 2019)	Medium

Table 12. Auto Flammability Study Summary for DIDP

No Autoflammability data was identified for this chemical.

Table 13. Viscosity Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Apparatus	Temperature	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental		20°C	108 cP		(<u>NLM, 2015</u>)	Medium
Experimental		298.25 K	87.67 cP	Reported as 87.67 mPa.s at 298.25 K, 0.1 MPa. Relative uncertainty was 0.8%	(Peleties and Trusler, 2011)	High
Experimental		25.1°C	88.70 cP	Reported as 88.70 mPa.s at 298.261 K; this source also measured viscosities up to 363.188 K	(Assael and Mylona, 2013)	High
Experimental		25°C	84.1 cP	0.1 MPa; The expanded uncertainty in the viscosity is estimated at 2%	(<u>Harris and Bair</u> , <u>2007</u>)	High
Experimental		25°C	88.4 cP	0.1 MPa; The expanded uncertainty in the viscosity is estimated at 2%	(<u>Harris and Bair</u> , 2007)	High
Experimental		298.24 K	87.797 cP	The estimated overall uncertainty of the results does not exceed $\pm 1\%$	(<u>Caetano et al.,</u> 2005)	High
Experimental		298.22 K	86.72 cP	Reported as 86.72 mPa.s at 298.22 K	(<u>Caetano et al.,</u> 2004)	High
Experimental		298.26 K	87.38 cP	Reported as 87.38 mPa.s	(<u>Caetano et al.,</u> 2006)	High
Experimental; Not Reported		298.13 K	87.76 cP	298.13K = 87.76 mPa*S; 298.58K= 85.30 mPa*S	(<u>da Mata et al.,</u> 2009)	High
Experimental; Not Reported		298.58 K	85.30 cP	298.13K, 87.76 mPa*S and 298.58K, 85.30 mPa*S	(<u>da Mata et al.,</u> <u>2009</u>)	High
Experimental; Not Reported		298.15K	87.2 cP	Sample A: 87.2 mPa*s (water mass fraction = 20E-6; density = 963.66 kg/m³) Sample B: 87.5 mPa*s (water mass fraction = 417E-6; density = 960.1 kg/m³) Sample C: 87.3 mPa*s (water mass fraction = 29E-6; density = 964.61 kg/m³)	(<u>Al Motari et al., 2007</u>)	High

Study Type	Apparatus	Temperature	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Calculation		298.15 K	88.44 cP	Reported as 88.44mPa.S at atmospheric pressure calculated by dispersion relation; dispersion between liquid and gaseous phases are described by an equation which relates acceleration of gravity, dynamic viscosity, interfacial tension, and density. SLS was used to determine interfacial tension.	(Froeba and Leipertz, 2007)	High

Table 14. Refractive Index Study Summary for DIDP

Study Type	Apparatus	Result	Comments	Affiliated Reference	Data Quality Evaluation Results
Experimental		1.483		(<u>NLM, 2015</u>)	High
Experimental	293.15 K	1.4845	Data consistent with the value supplied in the Merck Technical Data Sheet at the same temperature (1.485)	(<u>Caetano et al., 2005</u>)	High

Table 15. Dielectric Constant Study Summary for DIDP

No Dielectric Constant data was identified for this chemical.

EPI SuiteTM Model Outputs

(U.S. EPA, 2012)

CAS Number: 26761-40-0

SMILES: CC(C)CCCCCCC(=O)c1ccccc1C(=O)OCCCCCCC(C)C CHEM: 1,2-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, diisodecyl ester MOL FOR: C28 H46 O4 MOL WT: 446.68 EPI SUMMARY (v4.11) Physical Property Inputs: Log Kow (octanol-water): 10.35 Boiling Point (deg C): -----Melting Point (deg C): -50.00 Vapor Pressure (mm Hg): 5.28E-007 Water Solubility (mg/L): 0.28 Henry LC (atm-m3/mole): -----Log Octanol-Water Partition Coef (SRC): Log Kow (KOWWIN v1.69 estimate) = 10.36Boiling Pt, Melting Pt, Vapor Pressure Estimations (MPBPVP v1.43): Boiling Pt (deg C): 463.36 (Adapted Stein & Brown method) Melting Pt (deg C): 105.95 (Mean or Weighted MP) VP(mm Hg,25 deg C): 2.29E-007 (Modified Grain method) VP (Pa, 25 deg C): 3.05E-005 (Modified Grain method) MP (exp database): -50 deg C BP (exp database): 250-257 @ 4 mm Hg deg C VP (exp database): 5.28E-07 mm Hg (7.04E-005 Pa) at 25 deg C Water Solubility Estimate from Log Kow (WSKOW v1.42): Water Solubility at 25 deg C (mg/L): 1.006e-005 log Kow used: 10.35 (user entered) melt pt used: -50.00 deg C Water Sol (Exper. database match) = 0.28 mg/L (24 deg C) Exper. Ref: YALKOWSKY, SH ET AL. (2010) Water Sol Estimate from Fragments: Wat Sol (v1.01 est) = 1.039e-005 mg/LECOSAR Class Program (ECOSAR v1.11): Class(es) found: Esters Henrys Law Constant (25 deg C) [HENRYWIN v3.20]: Bond Method: 3.67E-005 atm-m3/mole (3.72E+000 Pa-m3/mole) Group Method: 4.06E-005 atm-m3/mole (4.11E+000 Pa-m3/mole) Exper Database: 1.11E-06 atm-m3/mole (1.12E-001 Pa-m3/mole) For Henry LC Comparison Purposes: User-Entered Henry LC: not entered Henrys LC [via VP/WSol estimate using User-Entered or Estimated values]: HLC: 1.108E-006 atm-m3/mole (1.123E-001 Pa-m3/mole)

VP: 5.28E-007 mm Hg (source: User-Entered)

WS: 0.28 mg/L (source: User-Entered)

Log Octanol-Air Partition Coefficient (25 deg C) [KOAWIN v1.10]:

Log Kow used: 10.35 (user entered) Log Kaw used: -4.343 (exp database)

Log Koa (KOAWIN v1.10 estimate): 14.695 Log Koa (experimental database): None

Probability of Rapid Biodegradation (BIOWIN v4.10):

Biowin1 (Linear Model) : 0.8833 Biowin2 (Non-Linear Model) : 0.9920 Expert Survey Biodegradation Results:

Biowin3 (Ultimate Survey Model): 2.4925 (weeks-months) Biowin4 (Primary Survey Model): 3.6612 (days-weeks)

MITI Biodegradation Probability:

Biowin5 (MITI Linear Model) : 0.7028 Biowin6 (MITI Non-Linear Model): 0.7039 Anaerobic Biodegradation Probability: Biowin7 (Anaerobic Linear Model): 0.5119

Ready Biodegradability Prediction: NO

Hydrocarbon Biodegradation (BioHCwin v1.01):

Structure incompatible with current estimation method!

Sorption to aerosols (25 Dec C)[AEROWIN v1.00]:

Vapor pressure (liquid/subcooled): 7.04E-005 Pa (5.28E-007 mm Hg)

Log Koa (Koawin est): 14.695

Kp (particle/gas partition coef. (m3/ug)):

Mackay model : 0.0426 Octanol/air (Koa) model: 122

Fraction sorbed to airborne particulates (phi):

Junge-Pankow model : 0.606 Mackay model : 0.773 Octanol/air (Koa) model: 1

Atmospheric Oxidation (25 deg C) [AopWin v1.92]:

Hydroxyl Radicals Reaction:

OVERALL OH Rate Constant = 26.2168 E-12 cm3/molecule-sec

Half-Life = 0.408 Days (12-hr day; 1.5E6 OH/cm3)

Half-Life = 4.896 Hrs

Ozone Reaction:

No Ozone Reaction Estimation

Fraction sorbed to airborne particulates (phi):

0.69 (Junge-Pankow, Mackay avg)

1 (Koa method)

Note: the sorbed fraction may be resistant to atmospheric oxidation

Soil Adsorption Coefficient (KOCWIN v2.00):

Koc : 1.099E+006 L/kg (MCI method) Log Koc: 6.041 (MCI method) Koc : 3.311E+006 L/kg (Kow method) Log Koc: 6.520 (Kow method)

```
Aqueous Base/Acid-Catalyzed Hydrolysis (25 deg C) [HYDROWIN v2.00]:
Total Kb for pH > 8 at 25 deg C : 6.408E-002 L/mol-sec
Kb Half-Life at pH 8: 125.185 days
Kb Half-Life at pH 7:
                         3.427 years
 (Total Kb applies only to esters, carbmates, alkyl halides)
Bioaccumulation Estimates (BCFBAF v3.01):
 Log BCF from regression-based method = 1.885 (BCF = 76.74 L/kg wet-wt)
 Log Biotransformation Half-life (HL) = 0.5524 days (HL = 3.568 days)
 Log BCF Arnot-Gobas method (upper trophic) = 0.081 (BCF = 1.206)
 Log BAF Arnot-Gobas method (upper trophic) = 0.950 (BAF = 8.903)
   log Kow used: 10.35 (user entered)
Volatilization from Water:
 Henry LC: 1.11E-006 atm-m3/mole (Henry experimental database)
                                 1117 hours (46.54 days)
 Half-Life from Model River:
 Half-Life from Model Lake: 1.236E+004 hours (515.1 days)
Removal in Wastewater Treatment:
 Total removal:
                       94.04 percent
 Total biodegradation:
                          0.78 percent
 Total sludge adsorption: 93.26 percent
 Total to Air:
                      0.00 percent
 (using 10000 hr Bio P,A,S)
Level III Fugacity Model: (MCI Method)
** Note: When the Log Kow is > 7, the model may be underestimating
the mass of material in sediment and overestimating the mass of
material in the water column (biota). Consider using the results
of the default EQC model. **
     Mass Amount Half-Life Emissions
      (percent)
                           (kg/hr)
                   (hr)
 Air
        0.27
                   9.79
                            1000
                              1000
 Water 15.7
                    900
 Soil
        83.2
                   1.8e + 003
                              1000
 Sediment 0.912
                      8.1e+003
  Persistence Time: 1.22e+003 hr
Level III Fugacity Model: (MCI Method with Water percents)
     Mass Amount Half-Life Emissions
      (percent)
                           (kg/hr)
                   (hr)
 Air
        0.27
                   9.79
                             1000
                    900
                              1000
 Water
         15.7
          (0.0139)
  water
  biota
         (15.6)
  suspended sediment (0.0229)
 Soil
                   1.8e + 003
                              1000
        83.2
 Sediment 0.912
                      8.1e+003
  Persistence Time: 1.22e+003 hr
Level III Fugacity Model: (EQC Default)
     Mass Amount Half-Life Emissions
```

(percent)

(hr)

(kg/hr)

Air 0.1 9.79 1000 Water 1.82 900 1000 (0.000122)water biota (0.137) suspended sediment (1.69) Soil 30.9 1.8e+003 1000 Sediment 67.2 8.1e+003 0 Persistence Time: 3.3e+003 hr

Data Evaluation Tables

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available and peer-reviewed database.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	3	3	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Physical State reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Lewis, R.J. Sr. 2007. Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary 15th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, NY. P. 435.

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available and peer-reviewed database.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	2	2	2
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Physical Properties reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Lewis, R.J. Sr. 2007. Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary 15th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, NY. P. 435.

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Other 1	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed original sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	3	2	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.5	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.5
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Physical Properties reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Oxford University Chemical Safety Data

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available, peer-reviewed database that provides references to a recognized data collection.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	7	5	7
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.4	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.4
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Melting Point reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Haynes, W.M. (Ed.) 2014. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. 95th Edition. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton: FL 2014. p. 3-194.

Study	RSC. (2019)					
Reference:						
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	Medium	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	2	1	2
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low	The analytical method is unknown and there is no indication that a reliable method was used	3	1	3
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	10	5	10
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	2	Overall Score (Rounded):	2
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 agreed with the overall rati	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Melting Point reported by this reference. Cited reference: Jean-Claude Bradley Open Melting Point Dataset

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low		1	3	
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	9	5	9
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.8	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.8
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 agreed with the overall ration	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Melting Point reported by this reference. Cited reference: Oxford University Chemical Safety Data

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method		3	1	3	
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	9 1.8	5 Overall Score (Rounded):	9 1.8
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Boiling Point reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Matrix Scientific

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low	The analytical method is unknown and there is no indication that a reliable method was used	3	1	3
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	9 1.8	5 Overall Score (Rounded):	9 1.8
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Boiling Point reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Oxford University Chemical Safety Data

Study Reference:	Caetano et al. (<u>2006</u>).					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1 1	1
Other Data	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	3	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Brito e Abreu, et al. (201	<u>10</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is non-standard but is expected to be appropriate.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	4	3	4
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study	Assael and Mylona. (201	3)				
Reference:						
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (20)	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (20	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	3	3	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (20)	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (20	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Caetano, et al. (2005)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Reference:	75.4	T	T ~ . T		T	
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome. Methodology well described, supporting theory lacking characterization.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is non-standard but is expected to be appropriate. Analytical method appears to be common, but no standard method is stated.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	5	3	5
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.67	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.67
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3	1 401015.		Overall Quality Level:	Medium

Study	Peleties et al. (2010)					
Reference:		1	1		, ,	
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Paredes et al. (<u>2009</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
YY' 1)		Sum of scores:	3	3	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Paredes et al. (<u>2009</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted	1	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	1
			Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:			
≥1 and <1.7	\geq 1.7 and \leq 2.3 agreed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Paredes et al. (<u>2009</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted	1	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	1
			Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:			
≥1 and <1.7	\geq 1.7 and \leq 2.3 agreed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Al Motari et al. (<u>2007</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available, peer-reviewed database that provides references to a peer- reviewed data collection.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	6	4	6
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.5	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.5
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Density reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Haynes, W.M. (Ed.) 2014. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. 95th Edition. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton: FL 2014. p. 3-194.

Reference: Domain	Metric					
		Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low	The analytical method is unknown and there is no indication that a reliable method was used.	3	1	3
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a secondary database with references to the peer-reviewed original source.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	8	4	8
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	2	Overall Score (Rounded):	2
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 greed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

Cited reference: Matrix Scientific

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available, peer-reviewed database that provides references to original sources.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	7 1.4	5 Overall Score (Rounded):	7 1.4
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Vapor Pressure reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Yaws, C.L. 1994. Handbook of Vapor Pressure, Vol 3 C8 to C28, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available database that provides references to original sources.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	7 1.4	5 Overall Score (Rounded):	7 1.4
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Water Solubility reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Yalkowsky, S.H., He, Yan, Jain, P. 2010. Handbook of Aqueous Solubility Data Second Edition. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. P. 1325.

Study Reference:	Howard et al. (<u>1985</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical substance structural features (e.g., presence of certain functional groups) and other physical/chemical properties	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	4 Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 agreed with the overall ration	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	High	Measured data are consistent with the subject chemical's physical/chemical properties.	1	1	1
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	7	5	7
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.4	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.4
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Cited reference: LabNetwork

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low	The analytical method is unknown and there is no indication that a reliable method was used	3	1	3
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	8	4	8
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	2	Overall Score (Rounded):	2
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

Cited reference: LabNetwork

Study Reference:	RSC. (<u>2019</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Low	The analytical method is unknown and there is no indication that a reliable method was used	3	1	3
Other	Databases	Medium	Data is from a publicly available secondary source with references to non-peer reviewed sources.	2	1	2
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
i			Sum of scores:	8	4	8
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	2	Overall Score (Rounded):	2
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	Medium

Cited reference: Oxford University Chemical Safety Data

Study Reference:	Caetano et al. (<u>2006</u>).					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer-reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	4	3	4
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3	, ,		Overall Quality Level:	High

Page **45** of **62**

Study Reference:	Peleties and Trusler (20)	<u>11</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear. Methodology and theory were well characterized.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is non-standard but is expected to be appropriate. The analytical method did not follow a stated standard.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High
The reviewer	agreed with the overall rati	ng for the Viscosity	reported by this reference	ce.	, -· •	

Study Reference:	Froeba and Leipertz (2)				T T	
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	High	The model had a defined, unambiguous endpoint AND the model performance was known and r2 > 0.7, q2 > 0.5, and SE < 0.3 (ECHA, 2016).	1	1	1
			Sum of scores:	3	3	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 with the overall rating for the	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Froeba and Leipertz (20)	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is non-standard but is expected to be appropriate.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	4	3	4
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High
	greed with the overall ratio		reported by this referen	ice.		
Study Reference:	Assael and Mylona. (201					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1

	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Reliability (Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	3	3	3
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1	Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	$2 \ge 1.7$ and $2 \le 2.3$ agreed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (<u>20</u>	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	\geq 1.7 and \leq 2.3 agreed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Harris, KR; Bair, S. (20	<u>07</u>)				
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Domain	Metric	O al!4 - 4!				
		Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance R	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
A	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Unbiased Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	2	1	2
Other D	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
N	Models		Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 reed with the overall ratio	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Caetano et al. (<u>2004</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	The analytical method is non-standard but is expected to be appropriate.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	4	3	4
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.33	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.33
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High
The reviewer a	agreed with the overall ration	ng for the Viscosity	reported by this refere	ence.		

Study Reference:	da Mata et al. (<u>2009</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum	<u>3</u>	3 Overall Score	3
			of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	•	(Rounded):	-
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	da Mata et al. (<u>2009</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	3 Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7 The reviewer a	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3	I WOODS		Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	Al Motari et al. (<u>2007</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR 2	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3 agreed with the overall ration	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available, peer-reviewed database that provides references to a recognized data collection.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	6	4	6
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.5	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.5
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Viscosity reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Lewis, R.J. Sr. 2007. Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary 15th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, NY. P. 435.

Study	Caetano, et al. (<u>2005</u>)					
Reference: Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	High	The methodology for producing the information is designed to answer a specific question, and the methodology's objective is clear.	1	1	1
	Reliability / Analytical Method	High	Data are obtained by accepted standard analytical methods, including, but not limited to OECD guidelines for physical-chemical properties or other developed standard.	1	1	1
Other	Databases	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
High	Medium	Low	Sum of scores: Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	3	Overall Score (Rounded):	3
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

Page **58** of **62**

Study Reference:	NLM. (<u>2015</u>)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	High	Data are measured or estimated for the subject chemical substance.	1	1	1
	Appropriateness	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Medium	There is no indication that the methodology for producing the information was biased towards a particular product or outcome.	2	1	2
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Medium	Analytical method is unknown but is likely to be appropriate based on the data's inclusion in a peer- reviewed/recognized database or other secondary source.	2	1	2
Other	Databases	High	Data is from a publicly available, peer-reviewed database that provides references to a recognized data collection.	1	1	1
	Models	Not rated	Rating of this factor is not applicable to this kind of information.	NR	1	NR
			Sum of scores:	6	4	6
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:	1.5	Overall Score (Rounded):	1.5
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

The reviewer agreed with the overall rating for the Refractive Index reported by this reference.

Cited reference: Lewis, R.J. Sr. 2007. Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary 15th Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, NY. P. 435.

Study Reference:	U.S. EPA (2012)					
Domain	Metric	Qualitative Determination [i.e., High, Medium, Low, Unacceptable, or Not rated]	Comments	Metric Score	Metric Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Substance	Representativeness	Not rated	The metric is not applicable to this study type (SAR).	NR	1	NR
	Appropriateness	Not rated	The metric is not applicable to this study type (SAR).	NR	1	NR
Test Reliability	Reliability / Unbiased (Method Objectivity)	Not rated	The metric is not applicable to this study type (SAR).	NR	1	NR
	Reliability / Analytical Method	Not rated	The metric is not applicable to this study type (SAR).	NR	1	NR
Other	Databases	Not rated	The metric is not applicable to this study type (SAR).	NR	1	NR
	Models	High	The models in EPI Suite TM have defined endpoints. Chemical domain and performance statistics for each model are known, and unambiguous algorithms are available in the EPI Suite TM documentation and/or cited references to establish their scientific validity. Many EPI Suite TM models have correlation coefficients >0.7, cross-validated correlation coefficients >0.5, and standard error values <0.3; however, correlation coefficients (r², q²) for the regressions of some environmental fate models (<i>i.e.</i> , BIOWIN) are lower, as expected, compared to regressions which	1		

			have specific experimental values such as water solubility or log Kow (octanol- water partition coefficient). Sum of scores:	1	1	1
High	Medium	Low	Overall Score = Sum of Weighted Scores/Sum of Metric Weighting Factors:		Overall Score (Rounded):	1
≥1 and <1.7	≥1.7 and <2.3	≥2.3 and ≤3			Overall Quality Level:	High

References

- Al Motari, MM; Kandil, ME; Marsh, KN; Goodwin, ARH. (2007). Density and viscosity of diisodecyl phthalate C6H4(COOC10H21)(2), with nominal viscosity at T=298 K and p=0.1 MPa of 87 mPa center dot s, at temperatures from (298.15 to 423.15) K and pressures up to 70 MPa. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 52: 1233-1239. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je600562n
- <u>Assael, MJ; Mylona, SK.</u> (2013). A Novel Vibrating-Wire Viscometer for High-Viscosity Liquids at Moderate Pressures. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 58: 993-1000. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je301306e
- Brito e Abreu, S; Avelino, HMN, T; Caetano, FJP; Fareleira, JMN, A. (2010). Density of Diisodecyl Phthalate at Temperatures from (283.15 to 363.15) K and Pressures from (0.1 to 65) MPa. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 55: 3525-3531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je1001413
- Caetano, FJP; Fareleira, J; Fernandes, AC; Oliveira, C; Serro, A; Simoes de Almeida, IM; Wakeham, WA. (2006).

 Diisodecylphthalate (DIDP) a potential standard of moderate viscosity: Surface tension measurements and water content effect on viscosity. Fluid Phase Equilibria 245: 1-5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fluid.2006.03.012
- <u>Caetano, FJP; Fareleira, JMN, A; Oliveira, CMB, P; Wakeham, WA.</u> (2004). Viscosity of di-isodecylphthalate: A potential standard of moderate viscosity. International Journal of Thermophysics 25: 1311-1322. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10765-004-5740-2</u>
- <u>Caetano, FJP; Fareleira, JMN, A; Oliveira, CMB, P; Wakeham, WA.</u> (2005). New measurements of the viscosity of diisodecyl phthalate using a vibrating wire technique. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 50: 1875-1878. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je050151n
- da Mata, JLC; Caetano, FJP; Oliveira, CMB, P; Fareleira, JMN, A. (2009). Viscosity measurements of diisodecyl phthalate using a vibrating wire instrument operated in free decay mode: comparison with results obtained with the forced mode of operation. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 54: 2562-2568. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je900113f
- <u>Froeba, AP; Leipertz, A.</u> (2007). Viscosity of diisodecyl phthalate by surface light scattering (SLS). Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 52: 1803-1810. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je7001623
- <u>Harris, KR; Bair, S.</u> (2007). Temperature and pressure dependence of the viscosity of diisodecyl phthalate at temperatures between (0 and 100) degrees C and at pressures to 1 GPa. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 52: 272-278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je060382+
- Howard, PH; Banerjee, S; Robillard, KH. (1985). Measurement of water solubilities octanol-water partition coefficients and vapor pressures of commercial phthalate esters. Environ Toxicol Chem 4: 653-662. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620040509
- NLM (National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine). (2015). PubChem: Hazardous Substance Data Bank: Diisodecyl phthalate, 26761-40-0. Available online at https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/33599#source=HSDB
- <u>Paredes, X; Fandiño, O; Comuñas, MJP; Pensado, AS; Fernández, J.</u> (2009). Study of the effects of pressure on the viscosity and density of diisodecyl phthalate. The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics 41: 1007-1015. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2009.04.002</u>
- Peleties, F; Segovia, JJ; Trusler, JPM; Vega-Maza, D. (2010). Thermodynamic properties and equation of state of liquid disodecyl phthalate at temperature between (273 and 423)K and at pressures up to 140MPa. The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics 42: 631-639. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2009.12.002
- Peleties, F; Trusler, JPM. (2011). Viscosity of Liquid Di-isodecyl Phthalate at Temperatures Between (274 and 373) K and at Pressures up to 140 MPa. Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data 56: 2236-2241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/je101256z
- RSC (Royal Society of Chemistry). (2019). ChemSpider: Diisodecyl phthalate (DIDP). Available online at http://www.chemspider.com/Chemical-Structure.30996.html?rid=50cc0e19-fb17-4a54-839d-c44fed21155e&page_num=0
- <u>U.S. EPA</u> (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2012). Estimation Programs Interface SuiteTM for Microsoft® Windows, v 4.11. Washington, DC. https://www.epa.gov/tsca-screening-tools/epi-suitetm-estimation-program-interface